

# THE CORRESPONDENT.

*Magna est Veritas et Prevalebit.*

VOL. I.

NEW-YORK, JULY 21, 1827.

NO. 26.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

For the Correspondent.

### SYMBOL DIVINITY.

MR. EDITOR—Having the most incontrovertible evidence that all the Sibil Bible, as well as every other mythology of the stars which Magicians and Astrologers have left us, is a language of Symbols, perhaps no better understood than Montezuma or Egypt's hieroglyphics; persuaded, also, that the inspiration of the scriptures is poetic, I invoke Moses in his muses to fathom by his five books the five starry zones in the cross of the equinox recess. In the music of the Spheres, the Hebrew 22 consonants answer to the diatonic scale, and the vowels to the staff or stave of the zones. The northern, zodiacal, and southern constellations in the horoscope form the antitypes of Calvary's crosses. (see the flag of England) The alphabet of the Chaldee Astrologers and Magicians, 36 in number, exemplifies the component parts of those crosses, which are the thieves of time; I mean the pillars of the 36 northern and southern constellations. *Pillars*, I call them, because Jachin and Boaz, of Solomon's Temple, are their Symbols.

I have voluminous testimony to demonstrate all this; and that the scripture, as well as Pythagorean divinity, proves that geometry, as Taylor in his Proclus says, is the vestibule to divinity. Music, numbers, and letters, are all concatenate with

Euclid's Elements, and as one. Matter, space, and time, are comprehended by a circle, whose triangle answers to matter, whose square to space, whose circle to time, that sibilant serpent of the Sybil which formed the periphery of the universe, who in the recess changed his coil; so that his head became in a reverse position after tempting Eve. (See the bunch of Bacchic and Eleusinean grapes, representing cycles of time as a pyramid. This was the forbidden fruit.) The genealogies from Adam to Christ, are circles of time personified. (See Malcolm's History of Persia, vol. 1, page 8.) All this is divinity by analogy, which is magic. (See Rev. Mr. Colton's Lacon; Aphorism, 328.)

For the Correspondent.

### ADDRESS TO CHRISTIANS, No. II.

In a former number, I took occasion to offer to the readers of the Correspondent, some observations of the Rev. Mr. Yates, concerning several different Bibles of the heathen nations, in which I promised to contrast, or rather compare them with the Bible of the Christians.

How transcendantly glorious will the Christian Bible appear, exclaimed Mr. Yates, when compared with such a system. This system, he says, is more calculated to promote the miseries than the happiness of mankind; for the God Vishnu is represented as teaching his disciple Arjun to enter on the murderous deeds of war,

and as enforcing his exhortations by arguments that destroy all human responsibility, and begetting in the soul a morbid indifference to the nearest connections in life.

If the reader will examine the 31st chapter of Numbers, he will have a fair specimen of the character of the Christian God, as given by inspired men. "Go," says he, to his disciple Moses, "enter on the murderous deeds of war; and they went and did as they were commanded, and slew all the males, (verse 7) but the women they saved alive. They burnt all their cities, and took all their spoil (verses 10 and 11.) Moses and Eleazer the priest went forth to meet the camp, but they were wroth because they had saved the women alive (Verses 14 and 15.) Now therefore kill every male among the children, and every woman that has known man by lying with him, but the women and children you may save for yourselves" (verses 17 and 18.)

Reader this requires no comment; the question is ready for your decision, whether the character of your God, as described in your Bible, is transcendentally more glorious than the character of Vishnu? Numerous instances might be quoted to the same effect; but I shall content myself with one more. See Exodus, chapter 32, verses 26 to 29: Moses says, "Whosoever is on the Lord's side let him come to me; and the priests came." He says to them, "thus saith the Lord, put every man his sword by his side, and go in and out from gate to gate throughout the camp, and slay every man, his son, and every man his brother—his companion and neighbors;—and the children of Levi did so, and there fell in that day about three thousand men." Will Mr. Yates assert that the Hindoo system begets

in them a more morbid indifference to the nearest connexions in life, than is here found in the peculiar people of God! But enough of this divine truth? Can any one read this book without anguish of heart, when he sees so many thousands of harmless and innocent women and little children hewed down like so many trees of the forest; none spared but the beautiful maidens, and they for no better purpose than —— I forbear. The thought that this is in obedience to the command of a righteous and merciful God!—Oh what absurdity. I presume now Mr. Yates will tell me, that in former times, it was said an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth; and again love your neighbors and hate your enemy. But since the gospel has been revealed to man, these maxims have been changed. He will say, we must not resist evil, but if any one smite us on one cheek we must offer the other, and if any man sue us and take away our coat, let him take the cloak also. He will assert, that the new testament does not admit of shedding blood, but every where recommends peace and good will to man. Yea, he will tell us, that the maxims of the new testament far exceed those of the old, and, perhaps, the next time we hear him preach, he will inform us, there is no variableness on shadow of turning in God; he is the same yesterday, to-day, and forever. Mr. Yates further remarked, that Vishnu represents himself in the Shastre, as being the author of all the bloody deeds that have spread desolation over the earth. If the New Testament does not ascribe to God, the authorship of all the bloody deeds that have desolated the earth, it does not require much discernment and but little acquaintance with ecclesiastical history, to perceive that the God,

who is the author of the Christian religion, is the author of the greatest part of the bloody deeds, that have spread desolation far and wide. Let the reader only acquaint himself with church history; let him comprehend the number of millions that have been slain for the honor and glory of God; then let him ask common sense, if the Christian's God is a God just and merciful?

Respecting the Persian Bible, Mr. Yates observed, that it ascribed to God some attributes worthy of his character. All that he offered against it, was that it contained no instruction how a guilty sinner can obtain pardon and eternal life. From this statement I am led to think it is a much better book than the Christian's Bible.

The third is the Koran, the bible of the Mussleman. The cry against this is, that the prophet teacheth his followers to slay their enemies. The reader will perceive that this is nothing more than Gods chosen people were commanded to do; and no more than Christians do if they have power. I can testify from careful examination, that the Koran is not inferior in its tendency to the Christian's Bible.

Thus, reader, you have laid before you by Mr. Yates, a missionary, several Bibles. You see he has condemned some, because they promote the miseries rather than the happiness of mankind; and one because it contains no information for the sinner to obtain pardon of a merciful God. The one he approves, when contrasted, he says, with the others, far transcends them in glory. Shall we, because a man of Mr. Yates' standing has affirmed this, believe it without examination? Is it not our duty to examine for ourselves; and if we find that the Christian's bible is

equally as pernicious as those that Mr. Yates has condemned, have we not a right to reject it also. G.

For the Correspondent.

#### APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS.

(Continued.)

*Paul*—Thinketh thou it becometh me to speak against a perfidious man, a desperate magician, and enchanter who hath resigned his soul to death, and to whom punishment and perdition will very soon arrive; who feigns to be what he is not, and by magic art practices illusions on men to their destruction? If thou hearken to his words, thou wilt peradventure lose thy soul and thy empire; for this man is exceedingly dangerous. And as the Egyptian Magicians, Janes and Mambren, who led Pharaoh and his army in blindness till they were overwhelmed in the flood; so this man in like manner persuadeth men, through the arts of the devil, his father, and works much evil by his necromancy; and seducing many, who are not on their guard, brings ruin on your empire. But I, seeing that the words of the devil are spread abroad by this man, strive with the Holy Ghost in groanings of the spirit, that by these means it may be made to appear what manner of man he is; for by how much he exalts himself towards the heavens, so much shall he be engulfed in the depth of hell, where there is weeping and gnashing of teeth.

Now as to the doctrine of my master, in which thou hast questioned me, those only whose hearts are pure, can attain to it; for I have taught that only which concerns peace and charity; and have set forth the words of peace during a journey from Jerusalem into Illyria; and above all things, I have taught that men should love one another.



that they do good to each other; that the great and the rich exalt themselves not, nor put their trust in the uncertainty of riches, but place their hope in God. That those in moderate circumstances be content with food and clothing. That the poor rejoice in their poverty. That fathers instruct their children in the fear of the Lord. That children submit to their parents, and to their wholesome advice. That those having possessions pay taxes to the ministers of the state. That women cherish and obey their husbands as their Lords. That husbands keep good faith with their wives, even as they would that they should preserve their chastity; for whatsoever the husband punishes in an adulterous wife, the almighty father and creator of all things punishes in an adulterous husband. I have taught that masters treat their servants with mildness. That servants serve their masters with fidelity. I have taught the churches of the believers to adore an all-powerful and invisible God.

Now this doctrine I have not learnt from man, nor by any man; but by Jesus Christ and the father of glory, who hath spoken to me from heaven. For when my Lord Jesus Christ sent me to preach, he said to me, go, and I will be with thee, and every thing thou shalt say or do I will justify.

Nero having heard these things, his mouth was stopped, and turning to Peter, he saith, and thou, what sayest thou?

*Peter*—All the things which Paul hath said are true. For these many years that I have received letters from our bishop's throughout the Roman empire, they have written me almost from every city concerning his acts. For as he was a persecutor of the law of Christ, a voice

from heaven called him, and made him to know the truth, because he was not an enemy to our faith through despite, but through ignorance. For before this time there have been false christs, as is Simon, false apostles, false prophets, who in face of the holy scriptures have set themselves to destroy the truth, and it was necessary to contend against them.

But this man, who, from his youth, hath applied himself to no other thing than the examination of the mysteries of the divine law, wherein he learnt to become the defender of truth, and the persecutor of error; so his persecution was not occasioned by enmity, but in defence of the law. Truth itself hath spoken to him from heaven, saying unto him:—I am Jesus of Nazareth, whom thou persecutest; cease to persecute me, for I am that truth for which thou appearest to contend. Then having understood that it was so, he abandoned that for which till then he had contented, and he began to espouse the way of Christ, which he since has followed, which is the true way for those who walk righteously.—Truth to them who err not, and life eternal to them who believe.

*Simon*—Good emperor, behold their machinations. So they have conspired against me.

*Peter*—There is no truth in thee, thou enemy of truth; but it is deception only thou utterest, as are all those things thou pretendest to have wrought.

*Nero*—And thou Paul, what sayest thou?

*Paul*—Believe what thou hast heard related by Peter and me, for we are of one sentiment, because we have one Lord Jesus Christ.

*Simon*—Dost thou suppose, O emperor, that I can hold my contro-

versy with these men, who have formed a plot against me.

And turning himself towards the apostles, he saith, list Peter and Paul; if here I can do nothing with you, we shall meet where you shall do me justice.

*Paul.*—Good Emperor, behold his menaces towards us.

*Peter.*—Why deride ye not this vain man, with his head turned; who, mocked by demons, thinks he will not be seen as he is.

*Simon.*—I excuse you at present till the time shall come when my power shall be made manifest.

(To be continued.)

For the Correspondent.

#### ORIENTAL CREEDS.

*Mr. Editor.*—You will confer a favor on a considerable portion of your subscribers, if you give a place to the enclosed article (from "*Gruber's New German Encyclopedia*," originally translated for the "*New-Harmony Gazette*," in which paper it recently appeared. The coincidence of the facts, developed by the German editor, with the statements which have already appeared in the *Correspondent*, and the corroboration of these statements which his illustrations afford, cannot but be obvious to all your readers, and have the effect of promoting the cause of truth.

CLIO.

#### ADAM.

*Translated from Gruber's New German Encyclopedia.*

**ADAM.** (*Man.*) The first man and father of the human race. The relation of his and his wife's creation, their fall through sin and their punishment, are contained in a mythic document, which the compiler of *Genesis*, at the return of the Jewish remnant from the Assyrian captivity, has incorporated with his collection,

—and which, by its style and diction, as well as by the differences in its facts and representations, is sufficiently distinguished from the first *Cosmogony* (i. 1—ii. 3,) and from the rest of the *Pentateuch*. The *Mythus* (religious fiction) is as follows:

When the earth was clothed with trees and plants, God formed the man out of clay, blew a living breath into his nostrils, and put him in a beautiful garden, in the land of Eden. In this garden were two trees,—a tree of life, (that is of a longer, more god-like life, immortality) and a *tree of the knowledge of good and evil*, (that is of a riper judgment, as God alone possessed, in contradistinction to infantine ignorance and innocence.) To eat of the latter the man was prohibited under pain of death; not so, of the first,—(that is, God would grant him immortality, if not coupled with wisdom; for otherwise man would become a god-like being.) After the man had looked in vain for a being resembling himself, God takes from his side, when asleep, a rib, out of which he forms a woman. (The Hebrew word *Isch* (man) is the masculine of the word *Ischa* (woman.) Afterwards she has the name *Hava*, (Heva, Eve) i. e. life, or the mother of the living.) Seduced by the *snake*, who represents the prohibition of God as the effect of jealousy, the woman eats of the tree of knowledge, and gives it likewise to the man. The consequence is, the loss of their infantine innocence, and the rise of a sense of shame and a guilty conscience, unknown to them before. They are ashamed of being naked and cover themselves with fig-leaves. Hearing from far the voice of God, who was taking a walk in the garden, in the cool of the evening, they hide themselves, and the man be-

ing asked by God, what he had done, lays the guilt upon the woman, and she, in turn, upon the snake. This transgression is followed by punishment. The snake is cursed to creep on her belly, to eat dust, and to be in eternal enmity with mankind; the woman is to bring forth with pain, and to be subject to the man. Upon the man, the least guilty, the curse does not rest immediately,—only the earth is to become barren for his sake, and with the sweat of his face, he is to till the ground for sustenance. He, who was destined for immortality, has to return to the dust, from which he was taken.—That he might not eat also of the fruit of life, and live for ever. God drives him out of the garden, the entry into which is watched by cherubs, to prevent his return. He now begets three sons, Cain, Abel, and Seth, besides other sons and daughters, and dies when 930 years old. According to the manuscript, *Jehovah*, (chap. iv.) the human race sprang from *Cain*, but according to that of *Elohim*, (chap. v.) from *Seth*.

A history of the different points of view, in which this beautiful and significant Mythos has been taken by the learned, would fill a large volume; we will here only mention the most prominent opinions respecting it; we will divide them into the *Historic*, the *Historising*, the *Allegoric* and the *Mythic* explanations. The first, or the *literal* acceptation, rules among the ancient fathers of the church. *Augustin* is their leader, whom *Luther* follows, who with *Josephus*, attributes to the snake before the fall, human language and legs and feet.—The modern dogmatists, down to *Baumgärten*, *Ernesti*, *Michaelis*, hold the same opinion.—This doctrine is amply refuted, (if with the unprejudiced Bible-reader

such a refutation be at all necessary) by the crude and unworthy representation of God—(he forms a man out of clay; sews him aprons!—takes a walk in the garden in the cool of the evening, and is jealous of the rising perfection of the human mind!) by the numerous purely *fabulous* traits of the narrative—(the cherubs, the speaking snake, the two wonder-trees)—and by being in opposition to the natural order of things; for, many attributes of the moral and physical creation, which are necessarily founded on the nature of the animal world, viz: the mortality of man, the labor pains of the woman, the form of the snake, and the abhorrence of mankind of a poisonous reptile, &c. are here represented as the consequences of the curse and as punishments. To avoid these stumbling-blocks, many theologians ventured upon.

2d. The *Historising* theory, which, though it took the narrative for history, traditionally with some, with others revealed, yet holds it to be figuratively expressed. We will take *Eichhorn's* explanation for a standard, viz:

“God created first a pair, in a paradisiacal landscape of Asia, but the man and the woman were separated from each other. Longing after a being like himself, Adam, having roamed about for some time, fell into a deep sleep and dreamed, that he was divided in halves. Awakened, he meets the woman, and took her for the part, which in dream had been taken from him. The tree of life was a salutary plant: the tree of knowledge a poisonous herb, which, though it ruined the man and woman, was with impunity, as often is the case, eaten by the snake. *Eve* saw the snake ate and lived, and she ate also, doubting the sincerity of



God. The fruit caused in her inordinate desires (like wine, opium) and produced the first concubitus. Towards evening a thunder storm arose, and this novel phenomenon of nature they interpreted as the judgment of God. Their fear and anguish drove them out of the garden and the thunder and lightning (cherubs) frightened them from returning. The subsequent miseries of mankind he takes for the natural consequences of a guilty conscience. The descendants of Adam got this from tradition, but the poverty of their language forced them into figurative expressions, which in aftertimes were reduced to writing."

This opinion is still more reprehensible than the first, because of its incompleteness, inconsequence, and arbitrariness; besides that it often wrests the language and yet is far from removing all difficulties. We need hardly point out its arbitrariness which leaves to the Mythus hardly any of its original features.

The third explanation is the *Allagoric*. The fathers of the Greek church took it from *Philos*. According to him "the tree of knowledge, is the symbol of *cunning*, the tree of life is that of *piety*, through which the soul becomes immortal: the snake signifies *sin*, the man is the symbol of *reason*, the woman that of *sensuality*." This wants no refutation.

The fourth explanation is the *Mythic*, which from the peculiar character of the piece, and from a comparison with the rest of the original Hebrew history, we must declare the only correct and true one. We consider the narrative not as real History, but as a philosophical Mythus, or *Philosopheme*, under which appellation we understand those speculations of the ancient nations,

which lie beyond the sphere of experience, (e. g. the origin of man and of the world, and certain relations of the physical and moral world, put down by mystical narrations, which their fancy either freely created, or intermixed with or added to, some former traditions.) Such questions, as the later philosophers tried to solve by their *systems*, the more ancient, and chiefly the Asiatic nations answered by narratives such as these, with which they were particularly delighted. Even Jesus adopted this method in his parables. Thus was the problem of the diversity of languages solved by the Mythus of the Babylonian tower: and so is one of the oldest questions, which has agitated so much the ancient Orient: *How came evil into the world?* answered by our present Mythus, viz: "through man's own guilt, by his disobedience of God's commands, by his sensuality (nitimur in vetitum) and his inclination, contrary to his better knowledge, to follow the voice of *seduction*. As a corollary it adds, that man was happy only, so long as in infantine innocence he obeyed the orders of God, and that a state of guilt followed a riper information. Those evils, which the poet here paints as prominent, and which clearly show the oriental origin of the piece, are *hard-work* to the lazy oriental man a double punishment; the pains of the woman in child birth and her *servitude*, (likewise a purely oriental trait;) the necessity of death. Latterly, it seeks to explain several physical and moral appearances, viz: the attachment of the man to the woman, (ii. 23—iii. 16.) the singular form of the snake, the similarity of the words Isch, Ischa, (man, woman) and *Adama* (earth.)

To be continued.

---

## The Correspondent.

---

*Magna est Veritas et Prevalebunt.*

---

NEW-YORK, JULY 21, 1827.

---

### LECTURES DELIVERED AT THE FREE PRESS ASSOCIATION.

On the inconsistencies, absurdities, and contradictions of the Bible, by the Secretary.

Lecture Fourth, concluded.

A fascinating account is given of the luxuriance of the earth, its valuable trees, and its rich and enticing fruit. We are also told about the herbs and the plants of the field ; yet, as if the writer was trying how far he might play with the credulity of his readers, he says immediately after giving existence to this magnificent verdure, that "the Lord God had not caused it to rain upon the earth, and there was not a man to till the ground." If then, God could, and did render the earth originally productive without moisture, what use was there in creating rain, or dew, or rivers "to water the garden of Eden," as we are told in Genesis ? Either this water was necessary, or it was not ? If necessary, on what principle was it that grass, herbs, and trees were made to vegetate and arrive at perfection before rain had descended on the earth, or existence was given to rivers ? If neither rain nor rivers were necessary, of what use was it to set God a working first to create the waters, and then employing him the greater part of a day in gathering them 'together in one place?' Whence also came the rivers, when, as yet, there had been no rain ? It is, indeed, said that "there went up a *mist* from the earth, and watered the whole face of the ground." But who does not perceive in this attempt to account for moistening the earth, a proof of the gross ignorance of the writer of the book of Genesis ?

Entirely unacquainted with the fact, that rain is caused by evaporation, or, as he terms it, *mist*, he attempts to create a distinction where none exists, and clearly shows, in this instance, as he had done in many others, that he knew nothing of the first principles of natural philosophy.

Another glaring absurdity presents itself in this story of Adams' appointment to succeed God in the character of gardner. This event, it appears took place before ever the Deity thought of providing a helpmate for Adam.—"The Lord God (it is said) took *the man* and put *him* into the garden of Eden, to dress it, and to keep it. And the Lord God commanded *the man*," &c. Not a word is said about a woman ; nor is the existence of Eve even hinted at.—Why is it, then, that "the mother of all living," as she is called, was not associated with her husband in his rural employment ? It could not certainly be because Adam was not in want of a companion, to solace him, or assist in his labors ; or that she was incapable of that enjoyment which so felicitous a state presented. To suppose this, would be a libel on the Deity, who formed man for the enjoyment of happiness. The fact is, "mother Eve" did not at this moment exist. Adam stood alone, a solitary individual, without a single animated being to share with him the joys of his blissful abode. The Almighty who, it appears, was not at first aware of the desolate and forlorn condition in which he had placed Adam, soon became sensible of what he could not, without experience, ascertain. "And the Lord God said, it is not good the man should be alone : I will make him a helpmate for him." Then follows the account of the construction of Eve, from a rib of Adam's side, to which I alluded in a former lecture.



Although, at first sight, the circumstance of Eve's *subsequent* formation, may not seem of much importance, yet when we attend to another fact immediately connected with it, and which is established beyond the possibility of controversy, by evidence held sacred both by Jews and Christians, we shall be able to estimate its true value.

It is the most important feature in the bible system, that mankind became degenerated, and were driven out of paradise, in consequence of the disobedience of Adam and Eve, in eating the fruit of a certain tree, which God himself had strictly enjoined them not to touch under a severe penalty. Now, on turning to that part of the book where this positive command is said to have been given, and the direful consequences of its violation distinctly pointed out, we find that it was to the *man*, and to him only, this injunction was directed. "And the Lord God commanded the *man*, saying, of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat; but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil thou shalt not eat, for in the day thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die." These are the precise words of the 16th and 17th verses of the 2d chapter of Genesis. In the following, or 18th verse of the same chapter, it is added, "And the Lord God said, it is not good that the man should be alone: I will make him a helpmate for him."

Of all the arguments against the truth of the christian religion, appearing from the books on which it is based, there is none of them, in my opinion, which carries with it more force, than what arises from the fact just established. It overthrows completely the foundation on which the faith of a christian rests; for if it is true that the prohibition as to eating

the forbidden fruit, the supposed cause of all the existing evil, was confined to the *man*, before his partner had a being, it is perfectly obvious that she was free from all blame, in partaking of that fruit; consequently the doctrine of a *general* corruption of human nature, even on bible authority, falls to the ground.—

"Where there is no law, there can be no transgression," is a maxim well understood. We have the testimony of the sacred books of the christians, that the law given to Adam, related to himself only; it is not said that it was extended to Eve after her creation; nor does it appear that she ever heard of the prohibition from her husband. The secret, it would seem, a secret on which depended her own present and eternal welfare, and the future and everlasting welfare of her posterity, was carefully concealed from her, both by the Deity and her husband, who was as deeply interested as she, in its unreserved avowal. A serpent, instigated (as is said,) by the Devil, had the sole merit of disclosing the most important truth which, according to the clergy, ever met the ears of mortals. Agreeably to the christian mythology, Satan is its most important personage. He always defeats the purposes of the Almighty, and shows himself, in his whole management, the most skilful politician of the two. Christianity, without Lucifer, would, in fact, be a mere blank, and the priesthood would be deprived of the source of all their power, and of the means by which they are enabled, without toil, to wallow in luxury.

Let me now ask, what are we to understand by the two trees, which the writer of the book of Genesis, places in the middle of the garden? viz. the tree of life, and the tree of the knowledge of good and evil?—

The tree of life (it is said) was so called, because those who ate of its fruit were to live forever. As to the other tree, it does not appear what it was. "And God created great things, whales, and every living creature that moveth, which the waters brought forth abundantly after their kind, and every winged fowl after his kind. And God blessed them, saying, be fruitful and multiply, and fill the waters in the seas, and let the fowl multiply in the earth."

The formation of animals out of the earth, as mentioned by the writer of Genesis, was an opinion held by the ancients, from whom he evidently derived it. According to Lactantius, the ancients believed that the earth was the *wife of heaven*, and that when both were fresh and flourishing, they begot a numerous offspring, as well of plants as animals, which arose without seed. But afterwards, when this vigor decayed, heaven was said to be castrated, because it could not, as before produce trees or animals by its own strength. All things were thenceforward propagated by culture, sowing, or generation.

I have thus concluded the remarks which occurred to me on perusing the two first chapters of Genesis; and the more I reflect on the subjects of which they treat, the more I am amazed that mankind should have been so long the dupes of such a mass of romances; not one iota of which deserves for a single moment the attention of a rational being.—Yet nothing is more common than to find people persisting in their ignorance, and boasting, as if it were a meritorious act, of rejecting the light which nature presents to them, and which, if they took reason for their guide, would assuredly lead them to happiness. The mythological matters contained in the third chapter of

In the 19th verse of the 2d chap. of Genesis, it is said, "And out of the ground the Lord God formed every beast of the field, and every fowl of the air," &c. Now, on turning to the 21st verse of the 1st chap. of Ge-

Genesis, form the basis of a system rather by establishing principles of religion, which has extended itself over a considerable portion of the globe, and involved within its baneful vortex, millions of the human race. When reason, however, takes a view of the prominent features exhibited in that system, it will easily perceive that fiction, extravagance, and absurdity, are visible on the very record. It is pretended that the cause of the primitive apostacy, or what is called the "Fall of Man," is here unfolded with moral and theological correctness. But I shall prove in my next, that it is destitute of both these properties, and presents such singular departures from the laws of propriety, and the principles of truth, as must necessarily annihilate all divinity of character in these writings, and exhibit them, as they really are, to be the production of ignorance and imposture, the offspring of a barbarous age, when the human mind, enveloped in midnight darkness, was susceptible of any impressions, and when education was entirely in the hands of the creatures of despotism, whose sole object was to fashion their pupils agreeably to the views of their civil or ecclesiastical tyrants.

—  
*The Spiritual Mustard-Pot.*—

This is the title of a very excellent book, which, although published at Troy in 1824, has not had a circulation equal to its merits. The writer, whom we know, is a gentleman of talents, and has infused into his work a vein of irony which renders it the more interesting. We can recommend it to all the friends of liberal principles. The following extracts will give some idea of the author's style and manner of reasoning:—

"Religion diminishes the happiness of man, by placing, as I have said, virtue on a false foundation, or

virtue, which are hostile to the temporal interest of man. It appears to be a maxim, derived from the nature of religion, that our spiritual welfare should be preferred to our temporal, that the good of this life should be despised, when injurious to that of the life to come. But a man, with such principles as these, cannot obtain so much happiness himself, nor will he impart so much to others, as if he thought this life the only one, in which, he was to look for bliss. If he imagines the happiness of the present world to be unimportant to himself, he will not search for it, and therefore will not obtain it. If he imagines it unnecessary to others, he will neither assist them, nor sympathise with them, in their pursuit of it. If he imagines that his happiness in this life, is detrimental to that of the next, he will endeavour to overcome his passion for the former, and will live in a perpetual warfare, between the desires which he deems conflicting, of happiness in this world, and of salvation in the world to come. If he believes that others, in their pursuit of terrestrial pleasures, are neglecting their eternal interests, he will endeavor, as much as in him lies, to defeat their purposes, and to destroy their hopes of bliss. In these labors, he will be governed by the pious and benevolent desire of making men happy in a future world, at the expense of their peace in this. In favor of this purpose he will spare the infliction of no evil. It will be in vain to tell him, that he is not interested in the future welfare of others, for he will be aware that he is as little interested in their welfare on earth; and if it was said, that he would not feel the punishment that would be inflicted on the wicked, in the world to come, should he leave them to their fate, he might reply, that he felt not



the evils which he inflicted on them in this. Such would be the conduct of a man with the principles I have mentioned, for such conduct would be required by the spiritual interest of mankind, which is ever at war with their temporal good."

"Admitting that man is infinite in guilt, and that justice requires his punishment, the infidels cannot conceive, how the death of Christ can expiate that guilt. They believe that the innocent should never suffer for the guilty, and if man before the death of our holy saviour, was so sunk in guilt that God in his infinite mercy, could not pardon him, they cannot believe that he could be more easily forgiven, when he had added to his other crimes, the murder of the son of God. According to such principles of justice, a man condemned for murder, might inflict the penalty of the law upon some innocent person, expiate his guilt by another's blood, and go himself unpunished. Thus one murder might be expiated by the commission of another.

"The infidels indeed, regard this doctrine as more absurd and ridiculous, than that of transubstantiation. But here they err, by seeking to penetrate too far into the mysteries of the divine government. The justice of God it seems was such, that man, who had offended him, could not be forgiven without blood. Man had offended him, vengeance was his due, he could not in consistence with his justice decline it, though his mercy was infinite. He sends his son upon earth; that son dies upon the cross, by the hands of man; this crime committed by man, (compared with which his offences must be trifles,) saves him from the wrath of God. When Christ had died the death of a criminal slave, infinite misery had been suffered; it was sufficient. The debt of blood was paid.

The almighty Shylock had obtained his pound of flesh, not from him who owed it, not from his enemy, but from the body of his son. With this he was satisfied, and man, with due submission, might be forgiven. I acknowledge that these things are marvellous in our eyes, but we are not permitted to doubt."

The "Spiritual Mustard Pot" is sold at the Book-Store, corner of Vesey-St. and Broadway; Price 50 cents.

#### TO OUR PATRONS.

As this number completes the first volume of the *Correspondent*, we would respectfully remind our patrons, that agreeably to our original terms, the subscription for the next half year now falls due; and as it is desirable to save the expense of *collecting*, which bears heavy on the establishment, it is hoped that all who feel interested in our success, will order payment at our office.

We regret to state, there are some (though they are not numerous) who have received the *Correspondent* from the commencement, who are still in arrear for the *first half year's* subscription. If payment is not immediately made, their papers will be discontinued. Although our success has been equal to our expectations, and the *Correspondent* may be considered as *permanently* established, we cannot afford to furnish it for *nothing*, even should there be any individuals on our list so unreasonable as to expect this.

\*.\* Subscribers who intend binding the *Correspondent*, can have this neatly done to any pattern, and at a moderate price, by sending to the office of publication, corner of Vesey street and Broadway.

The *Correspondent* is published weekly, at \$3 per annum, payable in advance. No departure from this condition can be admitted as to *Country* Subscribers. Communications (post paid) to be addressed to the Editor, corner of Vesey-street and Broadway.

